

Deterministic generation of all-photonic quantum repeaters from solid-state emitters

Donovan Buterakos, Edwin Barnes, & Sophia E. Economou

¹*Department of Physics, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061, USA*

Abstract

Quantum repeaters are nodes in a quantum communication network that allow reliable transmission of entanglement over large distances. It was recently shown that highly entangled photons in so-called graph states can be used for all-photonic quantum repeaters, which require substantially fewer resources compared to atomic-memory based repeaters. However, standard approaches to building multi-photon entangled states through pairwise probabilistic entanglement generation severely limit the size of the state that can be created. Here, we present a protocol for the deterministic generation of large photonic repeater states using quantum emitters such as semiconductor quantum dots and defect centers in solids. We show that arbitrarily large repeater states can be generated using only two coupled emitters, reducing the necessary number of photon sources by six orders of magnitude. Our protocol includes a built-in redundancy which makes it resilient to photon loss.

Introduction

Quantum entanglement is the cornerstone of novel quantum technologies, particularly quantum computing and communication. The enormous interest in quantum communication is driven by its built-in security which protects the transmission of information and quantum entanglement for applications such as distributed quantum computing, quantum key distribution and quantum internet. To create distributed entanglement between two separated locations (nodes), qubits at each node must be entangled to flying qubits which are then sent to a common location to undergo joint measurements that implement entanglement swapping.^{1,2} To achieve entanglement between nodes at large distances, beyond the capabilities of optical fibers, the entanglement must be refreshed in intermediate nodes known as quantum repeaters.³⁻⁶ The standard paradigm for a quantum repeater was until recently based on atomic quantum memories located at primary nodes, each entangled with a single photon,⁷ which in turn is sent to a secondary, intermediate node.⁸ Two photons arriving at a secondary node undergo a Bell measurement, a process that transforms the qubit-photon entanglement into long-distance two-qubit entanglement where the two qubits involved are located at the two different primary nodes on either side of the secondary node. Difficulties associated with atomic-memory-based quantum repeaters include the necessity for long coherence times of the atomic memory beyond what is currently feasible and also the inherent vulnerability of these schemes to photon loss.

Zwenger et al.^{9,10} introduced the idea of using highly entangled states, known as graph states,^{11–15} to implement quantum repeaters. In a recent publication, Azuma et al.¹⁶ put forward an explicit construction of an all-photon repeater graph state (RGS) consisting of a completely connected graph of core photons, with each of them featuring a connection to an additional arm photon, to be used for entanglement swapping in the secondary nodes. This work has attracted a great deal of attention due to its advantages over atomic-memory based repeaters, notably the all-photon construction that avoids coherence time limitations, the resilience against photon loss, and the elimination of long-distance heralding.¹⁶ These attractive features position quantum repeaters, and consequently long-distance quantum communication, as near-term, much more readily feasible technology compared to quantum computing.^{17,18}

Despite the promise held by the all-photon RGSs of Ref. 16, construction of multiphotonic entanglement is extremely challenging. This is due to the fact that photons do not interact with each other, so that either a nonlinear interaction or measurement are required to entangle two photons that are initially in a product state. Both approaches are challenging because non-linear interactions are very weak and measurements are probabilistic. The standard process of generating graph states (or cluster states¹² for quantum computing)^{15,19,20} begins with pairs of photons that are prepared in entangled (Bell) states through parametric down-conversion. Two different pairs are then “fused” together probabilistically via the joint measurement of two photons, one from each pair. When the measurement succeeds, which happens with probability $1/2$ (or $3/4$ if ancillary qubits are used), a three-photon graph state is obtained. Such fusion gates are used consecutively to ‘grow’ the graph state.^{21,22} To date, up to ten photons have been entangled in this way.^{23–26} The analysis of quantifying the resource overhead of RGSs was carried out²⁷ and, even after an optimization of the original scheme of Ref. 16, 10^6 photon sources per node are needed. Overcoming the probabilistic nature of RGS generation would therefore be catalytic in drastically reducing overhead. Here, we show that repeater graph states of arbitrarily large size can be created deterministically by using quantum emitters with appropriate level structures and selection rules. The overhead of our approach is dramatically reduced compared to fusion-based approaches. Our remarkable finding is that the number of emitters required does not scale with the size of the repeater state: surprisingly, two emitters suffice to generate an RGS of arbitrary size.

A deterministic approach to the creation of linear cluster states was introduced several years ago,²⁸ and later generalized to a cluster state ladder.²⁹ The first experimental demonstration of deterministic linear cluster state generation was carried out recently following these ideas.³⁰ The number of emitters needed to create larger two-dimensional cluster states is equal to the linear size of the state, making the creation of a large square grid cluster state conditional on future advances in controllably coupling a long chain of emitters. Nevertheless, the concepts introduced in Refs. 28, 29 for one and two emitters are central to our present work. We follow these works in assuming an emitter that has the level structure shown in Fig. 1(a). We also consider that two adjacent emitters can be coupled such that entanglement can be created between them.




Figure 1: (a) Level structure required for the emitter to emit entangled photons. Each of two ground states couples to its own excited state. Cross transitions are forbidden by selection rules. (b) Linear photonic cluster state. Photons are blue circles, while the red circle is the emitter. Each line represents entanglement between the qubits it connects. (c) Partial $N=4$ repeater state. All but 2 of the 8 entangled photons comprising this repeater state can be produced from a single emitter.

Results

Lindner and Rudolph²⁸ proposed a method in which a quantum dot or similar system with the level structure displayed in Fig. 1(a) could be optically pumped to generate photons that are entangled with the electron spin. Moreover, they showed that repeated pumping of such an emitter can produce a chain of photons which can be entangled with the emitter and with each other. In particular, if the pumping is performed repeatedly without applying any other operations on the emitter, then a photonic GHZ state will be created in which every photon is entangled with the emitter and with every other photon. On the other hand, if a Hadamard gate is applied on the emitter between each pumping operation, then the resulting state is instead a one-dimensional linear cluster state in which each photon is entangled with the photon that preceded it and with the one that follows it. Fig. 1(b) shows the graph corresponding to this linear photonic cluster state. In this figure, each circle represents a qubit (blue circles are photons, and the red circle is the emitter), and the lines between them represent pairwise entanglement.^{13–15} Specifically, the state represented by a connected graph can be created by initializing all qubits to the state $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and successively performing CZ gates between all pairs of qubits connected by an edge of the graph.

Ref. 16 presented a family of repeater states, where each member of the family is characterized by the number N of external arms in the corresponding graph. For example, the graph that consists of the blue (photon) vertices in Fig. 2(c) represents the $N = 6$ repeater state. In the scheme of Ref. 16, one such state is generated at each primary node of the repeater network, and

entanglement swapping between primary nodes is performed by sending half of the N external photons to an adjacent secondary node, where they encounter an additional $N/2$ photons that were sent out from the repeater state at the next primary node. Entanglement between the primary nodes is then created by performing Bell measurements on pairs of photons that arrived from different primary nodes. The redundancy of sending $N/2$ photons rather than one reduces the sensitivity of this procedure to errors, so that more robust repeater networks are realized as N is increased.

Using only the pumping technique developed in Ref. 28, but carefully choosing when to apply Hadamard gates, large portions of photonic repeater states can be generated using only a single emitter. In particular, the complete subgraph of fully interconnected photons in the center of the RGS [see e.g. Fig. 2(c)] as well as two of the external photon arms can be generated in this way using only one emitter. For example, the portion of the $N = 4$ RGS that can be created is shown in Fig. 1(c). This state can be generated by performing the following sequence of operations on the emitter: $\mathcal{M}_Z H P H P H P H P H P H |0\rangle$, followed by single-qubit x and z gates on the four central photons. In this sequence, $|0\rangle$ denotes the ground state of the emitter, H is a Hadamard gate, P is the pumping operation, and $\mathcal{M}_Z$ is a final Z -measurement performed on the emitter in order to decouple it from the chain of emitted photons. One option for completing the RGS is to attach the remaining photon arms via probabilistic fusion gates.²¹ In the $N = 4$ RGS example, 6 of the 8 entangled photons (more generally $N + 2$ of the $2N$ photons) are produced using a single photon source. Constructing this state by fusing together three-photon GHZ states without the use of a photonic emitter would require 5 successful fusion gate applications (in general $2N - 3$ fusion gates are needed). Thus, we see that the utilization of a photonic emitter significantly decreases the necessary number of probabilistic fusion gates and the number of photon sources needed at each node, greatly reducing the overhead compared to what is needed to generate the entire state via fusion.

We now show that an additional dramatic reduction in the overhead can be achieved by introducing a second emitter. In particular, we demonstrate that arbitrarily large repeater graph states can be completely generated using only two coupled emitters. Inclusion of the second emitter greatly increases the flexibility one has in creating graph states. This is because entanglement between the two emitters causes the emitted photons from each to be entangled, and it enables a photon that is initially entangled with only one emitter to become entangled with the second emitter and to other photons that are entangled with the first emitter [see Fig. 2(a)]. Our scheme for deterministically generating RGSs combines these features of photon emission from entangled emitters with the fact that RGSs are closely related to tree-like cluster states.²² In particular, the fully interconnected web of photons at the center of an RGS can be obtained by performing an operation known as local complementation^{14,31} around the central “root” vertex of a tree, as shown in Fig. 2(c). Local complementation can be implemented by applying the single-qubit gate $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}}$ to the root vertex and the gate $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}}$ to each of the neighboring vertices. Single-qubit photonic gates are much easier to implement than gates on the emitters; thus, the generation of tree states can easily be extended to repeater states via local complementation.




Figure 2: Generation of the $N=6$ repeater state proposed in Ref. 16: **(a)** Top: Emitter B is connected to emitter A with a CZ gate and pumped twice, creating photons 1 and 2. Bottom: Hadamard gates are applied and emitter B is measured, detaching it from the graph. **(b)** This process is repeated (creating photons 3 and 4), generating another arm. **(c)** After N arms have been generated, local complementation is applied about qubit A , and emitter A is then measured.

Fig. 2 summarizes our scheme for deterministically generating the all-photonic repeater states introduced in Ref. 16. Our procedure for generating the underlying tree states involves using a single emitter (labeled A) at the root as an “anchor”, and then using a second emitter to generate each branch of the tree, one at a time. For each branch, the second emitter (labeled B) is connected to the root vertex by applying a CZ gate between the two emitters. The second emitter is then pumped twice as shown in the top parts of Figs. 2(a),(b), Hadamard gates are applied to one of the photons and the emitter, and finally a Z -measurement is performed on the emitter. This has the effect of severing the second emitter from the graph, leaving the other two photons attached to the first emitter in a chain as shown in the bottom parts of Figs. 2(a),(b). The second emitter can then be reinitialized, and the whole process can be repeated in order to generate an arbitrary number of branches in the tree cluster state. The full sequence of gates needed to create an RGS with an arbitrary number of external arms N (corresponding to an RGS of degree $N/2$) is given in the Methods section. The most challenging part of the sequence are the two-emitter entangling CZ gates. In the Methods section, we show that the minimum number of CZ gates needed is $N - 2$.

A crucial feature of our scheme is that all of the photons comprising an arbitrary repeater

state can be emitted by the same emitter. This is illustrated in Fig. 2, where emitter B produces all of the photons, while emitter A never emits even a single photon. The role of emitter A is to hold the different arms of the tree together while B generates new arms and attaches them to A . The fact that all photons are emitted from a single emitter makes it far simpler to ensure that the photons comprising the RGS are indistinguishable, as is necessary for the functionality of repeater networks. Photon indistinguishability will not be compromised if the two emitters are not perfectly identical as is often the case, especially with solid state emitters such as quantum dots. It is of course still necessary to achieve uniformity between emitters on different nodes of the network. This will be considered further in the Discussion section below.




Figure 3: A tree of depth $d = 2$ with $k = 6$ branches. Black edges represent entanglement created by pumping an emitter, while red edges represent entanglement created with a CZ gate between two emitters.

Our method can be generalized to deterministically create arbitrary tree states. More general tree states are important because they can be combined with graph states such as the RGS shown in Fig. 2(c) to create a similar state that is robust against photon losses.^{22,27} To create a general tree state, one emitter is needed for each level of the tree except for the bottommost one. In our proposed scheme, the first emitter is again used at the root as an “anchor”, and the second emitter is used to generate each branch using CZ gates as above. For each subtree, the second emitter is then treated as the new “anchor” and the third emitter is used to generate each branch of the subtree. This process is continued recursively until the last emitter is pumped repeatedly to create the leaves of the tree. This process only requires CZ gates between emitters on neighboring levels, so the scheme can be implemented in any architecture with linearly aligned emitters and requires CZ gates only between nearest neighbors. Emitters at every other level can be pumped twice for each vertex at that level, reducing the requisite number of CZ gates by 2 for each instance, as illustrated in Fig. 3. The total number of CZ gates needed to generate a tree of depth d with k branches at each vertex is given by the following formula:

$$N_{CZ} = -1 + \frac{k^d + (-1)^{d+1}}{k + 1}. \quad (1)$$

For trees with a large number of branches at each vertex, this is only marginally more efficient; however, this effect can make a drastic difference in the generation of much smaller trees. For a binary tree, in addition to reducing the number of CZ gates by a factor of 3, the number of emitters required is cut in half as well.

In Ref. 27, it was shown how to combine trees with RGSs to produce a much larger state




Figure 4: Encoded RGS with (a) depth-one and (b) depth-two tree structures. Both of these can be generated by pumping a single emitter, which is coupled to a second emitter via CZ gates.

that has built-in error correction and is robust against photon loss. The ability to perform X and Z measurements on the central photons is a crucial part of the repeater protocol. For the smaller RGSs discussed above, the loss of one of these central photons would cause the entire process to fail. The addition of trees attached to each of these central photons allows these measurements to be recovered in the case of photon loss.³² Fig. 4 (a) and (b) show two examples of repeater states with tree structures included; each of these states can be generated from only two emitters. The more complex encoded state proposed in Ref. 27, shown in Fig. 5, can be deterministically generated using our scheme with only three emitters. Creating this state from 3-photon GHZ states using fusion requires roughly one fusion gate per photon, and for the particular size shown, 173 successful fusion gates would be needed. Using photonic emitters instead, a similar number of pumping operations are needed, but only 32 entangling CZ gates are required between the three emitters, and only two of the emitters need to be pumped.

Our protocol for generating repeater states has many attractive features. First, RGSs of any size can be generated using only two emitters, with only one of the emitters actually emitting photons. In addition, the only multi-qubit gates required are the CZ gates between the two emitters. Large trees can be generated with the requisite number of emitters scaling as the depth of the tree, thus logarithmically in the total number of qubits. We quantify the practicality of our scheme by finding the fidelity of the RGS as a function of the individual gate fidelities of the gates used in the RGS generation sequence. In Fig. 6 we assume that the fidelities of single photonic gates and optical pumping are much higher than the fidelities of single unitary gates and CZ gates on the emitters, and thus the fidelity of the final states are essentially determined by the latter two. Fig. 6(a) shows the fidelity for creating the bare repeater state shown in Fig. 2(c), where it is evident that this state can be created with greater than 90% fidelity if CZ gate fidelities are above 99% and single-qubit gate fidelities exceed 99.8%. In the case of the error-correcting repeater state shown in Fig. 5, we see from Fig. 6(b) that reaching 90% fidelity requires CZ gate fidelities around 99.8% and single-qubit gate fidelities around 99.95%.




Figure 5: A large repeater state with $N=8$ (logical qubits) proposed in Ref. 27 which includes subtrees in order to make the state more robust against errors.

Discussion

There are several criteria in identifying systems to implement our scheme for deterministic all-photonic repeater state generation. First, the emitters must have the requisite level structure and selection rules, namely they must have two degenerate ground states, each of which is coupled to one corresponding excited state as depicted in Fig. 1(a). Note that for the repeater states shown in Fig. 2c and in Fig. 4, only one of the two emitters needs to satisfy this condition. The second criterion is that emitters should be coupled to each other to enable the entangling CZ gates. Third, the emitted photons must be indistinguishable, both at different nodes and at the same node, over the time it takes to generate and entangle repeater states. Fourth, the extraction efficiency of the photons from the emitter should be high. Fifth, the setup should be able to incorporate coupling to fibers in order to transmit the photons to the remote nodes with high fidelity. Finally, it is desirable to have high yield, meaning that the photons are generated at high rates.

Self-assembled quantum dots coupled to cavities satisfy all of these criteria. Their broken symmetry along the growth axis provides the desired level structure and selection rules, and pairs of quantum dots can be grown in a stacked configuration allowing for coupling between the two electron spins trapped in each dot via the exchange interaction. This interaction is the enabling mechanism for the inter-emitter CZ gate. In fact, the early works for 1D²⁸ and 2D²⁹ cluster state generation were based on quantum dots. In a recent breakthrough experiment, Schwartz et al.³⁰ generated deterministically a cluster state string of five entangled photons using a confined dark




Figure 6: (a) The fidelity of the $N=6$ repeater state shown in Fig. 2(c) as a function of the infidelities of the two-qubit CZ gate and the individual single-qubit gates applied to emitters (which are assumed to all have the same infidelity). (b) The fidelity of the large repeater state shown in Fig. 5.

exciton in a quantum dot. This work constituted a proof-of-principle demonstration that does not yet include optimization over the various metrics (photon generation rate, efficiency, etc). Over the last few years there has been great interest and rapid progress in single-photon devices based on quantum dots which can be harnessed for the repeater generation device we are proposing. One challenge traditionally associated with quantum dots is their spectral inhomogeneity, a severe issue for indistinguishability. Our scheme for bare repeater states avoids this difficulty since all photons are produced by a single emitter. However, it remains a challenge for the dressed repeater state shown in Fig. 5, where photons are produced by two different emitters, and for photons in different repeater states generated at different nodes. Several years ago, it was demonstrated that quantum dots can be tuned over a large spectral range, which allowed for photon interference coming from remote QDs,³³ and very recently it was shown that such tuning can be successfully implemented in a QD-micropillar device,³⁴ demonstrating indistinguishability of photons over more than 10 microseconds.³⁵ Another challenge that was recently overcome is the difficulty of photon extraction. Within the last year, several groups have shown photon extraction rates ranging from 66%³⁴ to more than 98%,³⁶ and very recently the chip-to-fiber coupling efficiency was shown to exceed 80%.³⁷ Efforts to engineer these systems to even higher metrics are ongoing, and we anticipate near-ideal metrics over the next couple of years.

Other types of emitters aside from quantum dots can also be used, with recent work³⁸ showing that several defect centers, including the NV center in diamond and in silicon carbide (SiC), as well as vacancy and divacancy defects in SiC, have the required level structure. Similar challenges

as in quantum dots are being addressed for these systems, namely the broad photon emission, coupling to cavities and photon extraction. There has been significant experimental progress recently in terms of emitter indistinguishability,³⁹ photon extraction efficiency,⁴⁰ and coupling to fibers.⁴¹ Purcell enhancements amounting to a 70-fold increase of emission into the zero phonon line have been achieved in NV centers in diamond,^{42,43} and protocols for suppressing spectral diffusion have been put forward.⁴⁴ Very recent developments with photonic crystal cavities in SiC have demonstrated an 80-fold enhancement of selective photon emission into the desired zero phonon line, i.e., without enhancing the spectrally closest transition.⁴⁵ On the other hand, the mechanism for the inter-emitter entangling CZ gate is not as clear as in the case of QDs, where dots can be stacked during growth. Recent experiments, however, have made progress toward controllable defect positioning;⁴⁶ this result can pave the way toward the design and demonstration of an entangling gate between nearest neighbor defects. In the case of a RGS that can be generated from pumping only one emitter, the second qubit could be a different system, such as a nuclear spin.^{47,48} Other solid-state systems that show promise are defects or quantum dots in 2D materials, including hexagonal boron nitride and transition metal dichalcogenides, where single photon emitters have been seen.^{49–53} The 2D nature of these materials allows for high photon extraction rates, and coupling to photonic crystal cavities has already been demonstrated.⁵⁴

With all the recent experimental developments, proof of principle demonstrations of our protocols for deterministic repeater graph states can be carried out using existing technology. The field of solid-state and nano-photonics is very active, with higher quality material and device improvements occurring at a rapid pace.⁵⁵ With these advances, a high-fidelity implementation of our designs should be feasible in the very near future.

Methods

Here, we give the explicit sequences of single- and two-qubit gates needed to generate the various repeater or tree-like graph states presented above. The sequence of gates needed to create an RGS of the form introduced by Azuma et al.¹⁶ with N total branches is

$$\mathcal{M}_A(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A \prod_{n=0}^{N-1} \left[(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{2n+1} H_{2n+2} \mathcal{M}_B H_B C Z_{A,B} \mathcal{P}_{B,2n+2} \mathcal{P}_{B,2n+1} H_B \right] * H_A |0\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Here, the photons which make up the RGS are labeled 1 through $2N$, H_n represents a Hadamard gate applied to the n th photon (the n th node of the graph), $\mathcal{M}_k$ represents a projective Z -measurement on emitter k , $CZ_{A,B}$ is a two-qubit CZ gate acting on the two emitters A and B , and $\mathcal{P}_{k,n}$ denotes the pumping/emission of the n th photon from emitter k . The pumping/emission process can be effectively described as a CNOT gate acting on the emitter and emitted photon, where the latter is initialized in state $|0\rangle$. We note that the combination of gates $\mathcal{M}_A(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A$ and $\mathcal{M}_B H_B$ are equivalent to Y and X measurements respectively. CZ gates between two emitters are generally the most difficult gates to implement. We can reduce the number of required CZ gates from N to

$N - 2$ by taking advantage of the first emitter's ability to generate photons at the beginning and end of the process, in which case the sequence becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{2N-1} H_{2N} \mathcal{M}_A (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A \mathcal{P}_{A,2N} \mathcal{P}_{A,2N-1} (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A * \\ & \prod_{n=1}^{N-2} \left[(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{2n+1} H_{2n+2} \mathcal{M}_B H_B C Z_{A,B} \mathcal{P}_{B,2n+2} \mathcal{P}_{B,2n+1} H_B \right] * \\ & (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_1 H_2 H_A \mathcal{P}_{A,2} \mathcal{P}_{A,1} H_A |0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Z measurements of emitters can either be performed directly or by pumping the emitter and performing a Z -measurement on the photon that is produced. Instead of measuring the second emitter between every branch, it is also possible to pump the emitter an extra time and proceed directly to the next branch, postponing the measurements of these photons until after the complete state has been generated. In this case, the sequence becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\prod_{n=1}^{N-1} \mathcal{M}_{3n+2} \right) * (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{3N-3} H_{3N-2} (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{3N-1} \mathcal{P}_{A,3N-1} (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A \mathcal{P}_{A,3N-2} \mathcal{P}_{A,3N-3} * \\ & (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}})_A \prod_{n=1}^{N-2} \left[(e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_{3n} H_{3n+1} \mathcal{P}_{B,3n+2} H_B C Z_{A,B} \mathcal{P}_{B,3n+1} \mathcal{P}_{B,3n} H_B \right] * \\ & (e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}})_1 H_2 H_A \mathcal{P}_{A,2} \mathcal{P}_{A,1} H_A |0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Alternatively any of the $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{Y+Z}{\sqrt{2}}}$, H , or $e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}}$ gates can be replaced with $e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}X}$, $e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}Y}$, or $e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}Z}$ respectively. This will produce an equivalent state from which the standard graph state can be recovered by applying Z gates on some of the final photons, depending on which gates were used. Such a correction would also be necessary if the second emitter is not reinitialized to $|0\rangle$ between measurement and reentanglement with the rest of the graph state. The particular photons that need to be corrected by Z gates can easily be determined by finding the stabilizer group of the produced state.

1. D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibl, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, “Experimental quantum teleportation”, *Nature* **390**, 575 (1997).
2. B. Hensen, H. Bernien, A. E. Dreau, A. Reiserer, N. Kalb, M. S. Blok, J. Ruitenberg, R. F. L. Vermeulen, R. N. Schouten, C. Abellan, W. Amaya, V. Pruneri, M. W. Mitchell, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, D. Elkouss, S. Wehner, T. H. Taminiau, and R. Hanson, “Loophole-free bell inequality violation using electron spins separated by 1.3 kilometres”, *Nature* **526**, 682 (2015).
3. H.-J. Briegel, W. Dür, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Quantum repeaters: The role of imperfect local operations in quantum communication”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5932 (1998).

4. W. Dür, H.-J. Briegel, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Quantum repeaters based on entanglement purification”, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 169 (1999).
5. S. Pirandola, R. Laurenza, C. Ottaviani, and L. Banchi, “Fundamental Limits of Repeaterless Quantum Communications”, *ArXiv e-prints* (2015), 1510.08863.
6. J. Wallnöfer, M. Zwerger, C. Muschik, N. Sangouard, and W. Dür, “Two-dimensional quantum repeaters”, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 052307 (2016).
7. E. Togan, Y. Chu, A. S. Trifonov, L. Jiang, J. Maze, L. Childress, M. V. G. Dutt, A. S. Sorensen, P. R. Hemmer, A. S. Zibrov, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum entanglement between an optical photon and a solid-state spin qubit”, *Nature* **466**, 730 (2010).
8. L.-M. Duan, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, “Long-distance quantum communication with atomic ensembles and linear optics”, *Nature* **7**, 789 (2011).
9. M. Zwerger, W. Dür, and H. J. Briegel, “Measurement-based quantum repeaters”, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 062326 (2012).
10. M. Zwerger, H. J. Briegel, and W. Dür, “Universal and optimal error thresholds for measurement-based entanglement purification”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 260503 (2013).
11. H. J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, “Persistent entanglement in arrays of interacting particles”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 910 (2001).
12. R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, “A one-way quantum computer”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
13. R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel, “Measurement-based quantum computation on cluster states”, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 022312 (2003).
14. M. Hein, J. Eisert, and H. J. Briegel, “Multiparty entanglement in graph states”, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 062311 (2004).
15. M. A. Nielsen and C. M. Dawson, “Fault-tolerant quantum computation with cluster states”, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 042323 (2005).
16. K. T. K. Azuma and H.-K. Lo, “All-photonic quantum repeaters”, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6787 (2015).
17. N. Sinclair, E. Saglamyurek, H. Mallahtzadeh, J. A. Slater, M. George, R. Ricken, M. P. Hedges, D. Oblak, C. Simon, W. Sohler, and W. Tittel, “Spectral multiplexing for scalable quantum photonics using an atomic frequency comb quantum memory and feed-forward control”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 053603 (2014).
18. K. Azuma, K. Tamaki, and W. J. Munro, “All-photonic intercity quantum key distribution”, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 10171 (2015).

19. M. A. Nielsen, “Optical quantum computation using cluster states”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 040503 (2004).
20. M. Zwerger, H. J. Briegel, and W. Dür, “Measurement-based Quantum Communication”, *Applied Physics B* **122**, 50 (2016).
21. D. E. Browne and T. Rudolph, “Resource-efficient linear optical quantum computation”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 010501 (2005).
22. M. Varnava, D. E. Browne, and T. Rudolph, “How good must single photon sources and detectors be for efficient linear optical quantum computation?”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 060502 (2008).
23. Z. Zhao, Y.-A. Chen, A.-N. Zhang, T. Yang, H. J. Briegel, and J.-W. Pan, “Experimental demonstration of five-photon entanglement and open-destination teleportation”, *Nature* **430**, 54 (2004).
24. W.-B. Gao, P. Xu, X.-C. Yao, O. Gühne, A. Cabello, C.-Y. Lu, C.-Z. Peng, Z.-B. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, “Experimental realization of a controlled-not gate with four-photon six-qubit cluster states”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 020501 (2010).
25. W.-B. Gao, C.-Y. Lu, X.-C. Yao, P. Xu, O. Gühne, A. Goebel, Y.-A. Chen, C.-Z. Peng, Z.-B. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, “Experimental demonstration of a hyper-entangled ten-qubit Schrödinger cat state”, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 331 (2010).
26. X.-L. Wang, L.-K. Chen, W. Li, H.-L. Huang, C. Liu, C. Chen, Y.-H. Luo, Z.-E. Su, D. Wu, Z.-D. Li, H. Lu, Y. Hu, X. Jiang, C.-Z. Peng, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, Y.-A. Chen, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, “Experimental ten-photon entanglement”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 210502 (2016).
27. M. Pant, H. Krovi, D. Englund, and S. Guha, “Rate-distance tradeoff and resource costs for all-optical quantum repeaters”, *ArXiv e-prints* (2016), 1603.01353.
28. N. H. Lindner and T. Rudolph, “Proposal for pulsed on-demand sources of photonic cluster state strings”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 113602 (2009).
29. S. E. Economou, N. Lindner, and T. Rudolph, “Optically generated 2-dimensional photonic cluster state from coupled quantum dots”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 093601 (2010).
30. I. Schwartz, D. Cogan, E. R. Schmidgall, Y. Don, L. Gantz, O. Kenneth, N. H. Lindner, and D. Gershoni, “Deterministic generation of a cluster state of entangled photons”, *Science* (2016).
31. A. Bouchet, “Recognizing locally equivalent graphs”, *Discrete Mathematics* **114**, 75 (1993).
32. M. Varnava, D. E. Browne, and T. Rudolph, “Loss tolerance in one-way quantum computation via counterfactual error correction”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 120501.

33. R. B. Patel, A. J. Bennett, I. Farrer, C. A. Nicoll, D. A. Ritchie, and A. J. Shields, “Two-photon interference of the emission from electrically tunable remote quantum dots”, *Nature Photonics* **4**, 632 (2010).
34. X. Ding, Y. He, Z.-C. Duan, N. Gregersen, M.-C. Chen, S. Unsleber, S. Maier, C. Schneider, M. Kamp, S. Höfling, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, “On-demand single photons with high extraction efficiency and near-unity indistinguishability from a resonantly driven quantum dot in a micropillar”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 020401 (2016).
35. H. Wang, Z.-C. Duan, Y.-H. Li, S. Chen, J.-P. Li, Y.-M. He, M.-C. Chen, Y. He, X. Ding, C.-Z. Peng, C. Schneider, M. Kamp, S. Höfling, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, “Near-transform-limited single photons from an efficient solid-state quantum emitter”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 213601 (2016).
36. M. Arcari, I. Söllner, A. Javadi, S. L. Hansen, S. Mahmoodian, J. Liu, H. Thyrrestrup, E. H. Lee, J. D. Song, S. Stobbe, and P. Lodhal, “Near-unity coupling efficiency of a quantum emitter to a photonic crystal waveguide”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 093603 (2014).
37. R. S. Daveau, K. Balram, T. Pregonato, J. Liu, E. H. Lee, J. D. Song, V. Verma, R. Mirin, S. W. Nam, L. Midolo, S. Stobbe, K. Srinivasan, and P. Lodhal, “Efficient fiber-coupled single-photon source based on quantum dots in a photonic-crystal waveguide”, arXiv:1610.08670 (2016).
38. S. E. Economou and P. Dev, “Electronic structure of silicon vacancy centers in 4H-SiC”, *Nanotechnology* **27**, 504001 (2016).
39. A. Sipahigil, M. L. Goldman, E. Togan, Y. Chu, M. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, A. S. Zibrov, A. Kubanek, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum interference of single photons from remote nitrogen vacancy centers in diamond”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 143601 (2012).
40. M. Gould, E. R. Schmidgall, S. Dadgostar, F. Hatami, and K.-M. C. Fu, “Efficient extraction of zero-phonon-line photons from single nitrogen-vacancy centers in an integrated gap-on-diamond platform”, *Phys. Rev. Applied* **6**, 011001 (2016).
41. T. G. Tiecke, K. P. Nayak, J. D. Thompson, T. Peyronel, N. P. de Leon, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, “Efficient fiber-optical interface for nanophotonic devices”, *Optica* **2**, 70 (2015).
42. A. Faraon, C. Santori, Z. H. Huang, V. M. Acosta, and R. G. Beausoleil, “Coupling of nitrogen-vacancy centers to photonic crystal cavities in monocrystalline diamond”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 033604 (2012).
43. L. Li, T. Schröder, E. H. Chen, M. Walsh, I. Bayn, J. Goldstein, O. Gaathon, M. E. Trusheim, M. Lu, J. Mower, M. Cotlet, M. L. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, and D. Englund, “Coherent spin control of a nanocavity-enhanced qubit in diamond”, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6173 (2015).
44. H. F. Fotso, A. E. Feiguin, D. D. Awschalom, and V. V. Dobrovitski, “Suppressing spectral diffusion of emitted photons with optical pulses”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 033603 (2016).

45. D. O. Bracher, X. Zhang, and E. L. Hu, “Selective purcell enhancement of two closely linked zero-phonon transitions of a silicon carbide color center”, arXiv:1609.03918 (2016).
46. J. Wang, Y. Zhou, X. Zhang, F. Liu, Y. Li, K. Li, Z. Liu, G. Wang, and W. Gao, “High-efficiency generation of nanoscale single silicon vacancy defect array in silicon carbide”, arXiv:1610.03978 (2016).
47. G. D. Fuchs, G. Burkard, P. V. Klimov, and D. D. Awschalom, “A quantum memory intrinsic to single nitrogen-vacancy centres in diamond”, *Nature Physics* **414**, 413 (2001).
48. M. V. G. Dutt, L. Childress, L. Jiang, E. Togan, J. Maze, F. Jelezko, A. S. Zibrov, P. R. Hemmer, and M. D. Lukin, “Quantum register based on individual electronic and nuclear spin qubits in diamond”, *Science* **316**, 312 (2007).
49. A. Srivastava, M. Sidler, A. V. Allain, D. S. Lembke, A. Kis, and A. Imamoglu, “Optically active quantum dots in monolayer WSe₂”, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 491 (2015).
50. Y.-M. He, G. Clark, J. R. Schaibley, Y. He, M.-C. Chen, Y.-J. Wei, X. Ding, Q. Zhang, W. Yao, X. Xu, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, “Single quantum emitters in monolayer semiconductors”, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 497 (2015).
51. M. Koperski, K. Nogajewski, A. Arora, V. Cherkez, P. Mallet, J.-Y. Veuillen, J. Marcus, P. Kos-sacki, and M. Potemski, “Single photon emitters in exfoliated WSe₂ structures”, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 503 (2015).
52. C. Chakraborty, L. Kinnischtzke, K. M. Goodfellow, R. Beams, and A. N. Vamivakas, “Voltage-controlled quantum light from an atomically thin semiconductor”, *Nature Nanotechnology* **10**, 507 (2015).
53. T. T. Tran, K. Bray, M. J. Ford, M. Toth, and I. Aharonovich, “Quantum emission from hexagonal boron nitride monolayers”, *Nature Nanotechnology* **11**, 37 (2016).
54. S. Wu, S. Buckley, J. R. Schaibley, L. Feng, J. Yan, D. G. Mandrus, F. Hatami, W. Yao, J. Vučković, and A. Majumdar, “Monolayer semiconductor nanocavity lasers with ultralow thresholds”, *Nature* **520**, 69 (2015).
55. I. Aharonovich, D. Englund, and M. Toth, “Solid-state single photon emitters”, *Nature Photonics* **10**, 631 (2016).